

The response of smokers to health warnings on packs in the United Kingdom and Norway following the introduction of standardised packaging

Crawford Moodie PhD¹, Catherine Best PhD¹, Ingeborg Lund PhD,² Janne Scheffels PhD², Nathan Critchlow PhD¹, Martine Stead BA¹, Ann McNeill PhD³, Sara Hitchman PhD³, Anne Marie Mackintosh BSc¹

¹ Institute for Social Marketing and Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland.

² Norwegian Institute for Public Health, Oslo, 0456, Norway.

³ National Addiction Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, SE5 8BB, England.

Corresponding author: Crawford Moodie, Institute for Social Marketing and Health, Faculty of Health Science and Sport, University of Stirling, Stirlingshire FK9 4LA. Email: c.s.moodie@stir.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0)1786 466456

© The Author(s) 2021. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for Research on Nicotine and Tobacco.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Introduction: Standardised packaging was phased in between May 2016 and May 2017 in the UK and July 2017 and July 2018 in Norway. In both countries the health warnings on packs prior to standardised packaging being implemented were from the former Tobacco Products Directive library of warnings (text warnings covering 43% of the pack front and pictorial warnings covering 53% of the pack reverse). The warnings on packs, post-implementation, were from the current Tobacco Products Directive library of warnings (novel pictorial warnings covering 65% of the pack front and reverse) for the UK but unchanged in Norway.

Methods: Longitudinal online surveys were conducted prior to standardised packaging (UK: April-May 2016; Norway: May-June 2017) and post-implementation (UK: October-November 2017; Norway: August-September 2018). We explored smokers' response to the on-pack warnings (salience, cognitive reactions, behavioural reactions).

Results: In the UK, noticing warnings on packs, reading or looking closely at them, thinking about them, thinking about the health risks, avoidant behaviours, forgoing cigarettes and being more likely to quit due to the warnings significantly increased from waves 1 to 2, and then decreased from waves 2 to 3, but remained higher than at wave 1. In Norway, noticing warnings, reading or looking closely at them, thinking about them, thinking about the health risks, and being more likely to quit due to the warnings significantly decreased from waves 1 to 2; avoidant behaviours and forgoing cigarettes remained unchanged.

Conclusions: The inclusion of large novel pictorial warnings on standardised packs increases warning salience and effectiveness.

Keywords: Standardised Packaging, Warnings, Policy, Cessation

Implications: Two longitudinal online surveys in the UK and Norway explored the impact of standardised packaging on warning salience and effectiveness. That warning salience and effectiveness only increased in the UK post-implementation, where standardised packaging was implemented alongside new larger pictorial warnings on the pack front and reverse, and not in Norway, where standardised packaging was introduced but older smaller text warnings (pack front) and pictorial warnings (pack reverse) were retained, highlights the importance of removing full branding and introducing stronger warnings simultaneously.

Accepted Manuscript

Introduction

In 2012 Australia became the first country to legally require tobacco products to be sold in standardised (plain) packaging. Thirteen countries have subsequently fully-implemented this policy, including at least one country in all WHO regions except Africa. The core aims of standardised packaging are to reduce the appeal of the packaging and smoking, reduce misperceptions of harm as a consequence of pack design, and increase the salience and effectiveness of the on-pack warnings,¹ which is the focus of this paper.

Prior to standardised packaging being introduced in the UK, eye-tracking research^{2,3} and naturalistic studies, where smokers used standardised packs for one or two weeks,^{4,5} found warnings to be more salient and effective on standardised packs than on fully-branded packs. These studies provided important insight into eye-movements towards warnings on standardised packs in laboratory settings, and self-reported response to warnings on standardised packs over a short period of time. However, they were not able to offer any understanding as to whether this response would reflect what happens in countries with standardised packaging or be sustained over time.

In the first five countries to have fully-implemented standardised packaging (Australia, France, UK, New Zealand, Norway), the sell-through period, i.e. the time they had to sell remaining fully-branded packs, ranged from two to twelve months.⁶ Several studies, all in the UK, explored smokers' response to the on-pack warnings during this period. Eye-tracking research with daily or weekly smokers found more than twice the number of fixations to warnings on standardised packs than on fully-branded packs.⁷ Poundall et al⁸ showed university students images of fully-branded and standardised packs and found that smokers and non-smokers were more likely to report noticing the warnings on a standardised pack, and indicate that they would put them off smoking. Both studies were conducted before standardised packs were widely available on the market however. An online survey conducted near the end of the sell-through period, when both fully-branded and standardised packs were on sale, found that smokers using standardised packs were more likely than

those who had never used standardised packs to have noticed and read or looked closely at the warnings.⁹ While these findings suggest that standardised packaging may improve the impact of warnings, at least during the sell-through period, when they are novel, there is a need for pre-post comparisons and cohort designs to explore the effect of habituation.¹⁰

Several studies have explored smokers' response to on-pack warnings since standardised packaging has been implemented. Serial cross-sectional telephone surveys in Australia found a significant increase in the proportion of smokers having strong cognitive and emotional responses to warnings and engaging in avoidant behaviour six months post-standardised packaging.¹¹ Yong et al¹² found that a year after the introduction of standardised packaging in Australia there was an increase among smokers in looking at warnings before branding on packs, noticing warnings, cognitive reactions to warnings and avoidant behaviour, but not in reading warnings or forgoing cigarettes. Using cross-sectional telephone surveys in Australia, research found that compared to smokers recruited pre-standardised packaging those recruited one-year post-standardised packaging were more likely to report noticing warnings, avoid specific warnings when buying tobacco, cover packs, and attribute much motivation to quit to warnings.¹³ Longitudinal surveys in seven European countries (England, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Spain) found that approximately a year after the inclusion of novel pictorial warnings on packs in all countries, as a result of the Tobacco Products Directive (TPD),¹⁴ the greatest increase in warning salience was in England, the only country in which standardised packaging had been fully-implemented.¹⁵

A limitation of the aforementioned research is that it was not possible to extricate the role of the novel, larger warnings from the removal of full branding.^{9,16,17} This is because in Australia and the UK, and many countries with standardised packaging, the removal of full branding and inclusion of larger novel warnings are introduced simultaneously. Norway is a notable exception. As part of the European Free Trade Association, Norway is not part of the EU but submits to EU regulations, such as the TPD, although not necessarily at the same time as EU member countries. When Norway

implemented standardised packaging, it did so prior to transposing the current TPD into Norwegian law. The current TPD, which was transposed into UK law, requires packs of cigarettes and rolling tobacco to display one of 14 pictorial warnings on 65% of the pack front and reverse.¹⁴ There are 14 warning messages (e.g. 'Smoking causes heart attacks') and three sets of pictorials for each message, with these sets rotated annually. Norway instead retained the warnings required by the former TPD, which stipulated that packs of cigarettes and rolling tobacco had to display one of two text warnings on 30-35% of the pack front and one of 14 pictorial warnings on 40-50% of the pack reverse.¹⁶ All warnings required a black border, which increased the proportion of the pack surfaces covered.¹⁶ There were 14 warning messages (e.g. 'Smoking causes fatal lung cancer') in the former TPD and three different pictorials for each message, but unlike the current TPD countries were not obliged to rotate the pictorials and instead free to select which one of the three pictorials they wanted to accompany each warning message.

In this study we explored the impact of standardised packaging on warning salience and effectiveness among smokers in the UK and Norway. In both countries the warnings pre-standardised packaging were the same type (text-only on pack front, pictorial on pack reverse) and size (43% of pack front, 53% of pack reverse), with the same positioning (starting from the bottom of the pack) and very similar content (warning text and images). There was some variation in content, with additional text used for three warnings in the UK (e.g. 'You can do it, we can help. Your doctor or pharmacist can help you stop smoking' rather than 'Your doctor or pharmacist can help you stop smoking') and six of the 14 pictorials were different, but otherwise the warnings in both countries were very similar. Post-standardised packaging, the warnings in Norway were unchanged, with the warnings in the UK taken from the current TPD (novel pictorial warnings starting from the top of the pack and covering 65% of the main display areas), see Figure 1.

Figure 1 here

Methods

Design and sample

In the UK, the 'Adult Tobacco Policy Survey' is a longitudinal online survey, following a cohort of cigarette smokers recruited pre-standardised packaging (April-May 2016) and followed up 5-6 months post-standardised packaging (October-November 2017) and 24-25 months post-standardised packaging (May-June 2019). To be eligible for inclusion at Wave (W) 1, participants had to be 16 or over and report smoking cigarettes (factory-made and/or hand-rolled) in the last three months. The sample was recruited from the online panel of YouGov, a market research company. Randomly selected panel members received an email invite to participate and a survey link if they chose to do so. Of the 13930 invitations sent to panel members whose profiling data suggested they were smokers, 8758 people clicked on the link and 1599 were screened out for not meeting the inclusion criteria. Of the 7159 who started the survey, there were 665 non-completers and YouGov removed 260 participants for data quality issues (e.g. straight-lining), leaving 6234 participants. An additional participant was removed by the research team at W2 as their data could not be linked.

Participants at W1 were re-contacted at W2 and again at W3, even if they had not participated at W2. Of the 6233 cigarette smokers at W1, 4293 were followed up at W2 (3629 cigarette smokers, 607 ex-cigarette smokers, 36 non-cigarette smokers, 7 cigarette smokers that had not smoked in the past three months, 14 missing data on smoking status) and 3175 at W3 (2412 cigarette smokers, 700 ex-cigarette smokers, 44 non-cigarette smokers, 6 cigarette smokers that had not smoked in the past three months, 13 missing data on smoking status). Participants received an increased incentive at each wave in an attempt to increase retention: 200 points on their YouGov account (equivalent to £2.00) at W1, 300 points at W2, and 400 points at W3. An information page was provided at the start of the survey, with explicit consent required for participation. The study

received ethical approval from the University of Stirling, with the first two waves approved by the Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport Ethics Committee and the third by the General University Ethical Panel.

In Norway, a longitudinal online survey followed a cohort of smokers and snus users pre-standardised packaging (May-June 2017) who were followed up 2-3 months post-standardised packaging (August-September 2018). To be eligible for inclusion at W1, participants had to be 16 or over and report smoking cigarettes (factory-made and/or hand-rolled) in the last three months. Participants were drawn from the online panel of Kantar TNS. To find eligible participants, Kantar firstly asked individuals about their use of tobacco, with participants then drawn from this pool of tobacco users. We do not have details on the number of participants invited or completion rate. A total of 1665 smokers participated at W1, with 1051 of these responding at W2 (813 smokers, 230 ex-smokers, 4 non-cigarette smokers, 1 had not smoked in the past three months, 3 missing). Participants received points on their Kantar account at each wave. The study received ethical approval from the data protection officer at the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Measures

Demographics

In the UK information was captured on age, gender, household income, and highest educational qualification. Age at W1 was recoded into '16-24', '25-39', '40-55' and '56 and over'. Annual household income was categorised as Low (under £30,000), Medium (£30,000 to £44,999), High (£45,000 and over), and Don't know or prefer not to answer. Highest educational qualification obtained was categorised as Low (High school), Medium (Technical, trade school, A levels, or community college), High (University degree or higher degree), and Don't know or prefer not to say.

In Norway, information was captured on age, gender, household income and highest educational qualification. The same age groups were used as for the UK. Annual household income was categorised as Low (under 600,000 NOK), Medium (600,000 to 999,999 NOK), High (1 million NOK and over) and Don't know or prefer not to answer. Education was categorised as Low (High school), Medium (Technical, trade school), High (4 years or more university or college) and Don't know or prefer not to say.

Smoking status

At W1 participants in the UK were asked 'Which of the following best applies to you? Please note cigarettes refer to those that are factory-made (packet) and also those that are hand-rolled (rolling tobacco). Cigarettes do not include electronic cigarettes or vaping devices.' The response options were 'I smoke cigarettes (including hand-rolled) every day', 'I smoke cigarettes (including hand-rolled), but not every day', 'I do not smoke cigarettes at all, but I do smoke tobacco of some kind (e.g. Pipe, cigar or shisha)', 'I have stopped smoking completely in the last year', 'I stopped smoking completely more than a year ago', 'I have never been a smoker' and 'Don't know.' Non-daily cigarette smokers were subsequently asked: 'Can we just confirm, how often do you currently smoke cigarettes (either factory-made or hand-rolled)?', with response options 'At least once a week', 'Less than once a week, but at least once a month', 'Less than once a month, but at least once in the last three months', 'I have not smoked cigarettes in the last three months' and 'Don't know.' Participants were categorised as cigarette smokers if they indicated that they had smoked at least once in the last three months. At W2 and W3 the 'I have never been a smoker' option was dropped.

In Norway, participants were asked, at both waves, 'Which of the following applies best for you?' with response options 'I smoke cigarettes or RYO every day', 'I smoke cigarettes or RYO, but not every day', 'I don't smoke/have quit smoking' and 'Don't know'. Non-daily cigarette smokers

were asked 'In the last three months, how often have you smoked cigarettes?' with response options 'At least once a week', 'Less than once a week, but at least once a month', 'Less than once a month, but at least once in the last three months', 'I have not smoked in the last three months' and 'Don't know'. Participants were categorised as cigarette smokers if they indicated that they had smoked at least once in the last three months.

Cigarettes per day

The number of cigarettes smoked per day was coded as 10 or fewer (coded as 0), 11-20 (coded as 1), 21-30 (coded as 2), and 31 or more (coded as 3). Missing cases were included as a 'missing' category.

Warning salience

Participants were asked 'In the last 30 days how often, if at all, have you... 'noticed the warning labels on packs?' and 'read or looked closely at the warning labels on packs' with response options 'Never', 'Rarely', 'Sometimes', 'Often', 'Very often' and 'Don't know'. Responses were coded as 'Often/Very often' vs 'Never, Rarely or Sometimes', with participants responding 'Don't know' excluded from the analysis. For the proportions responding 'Don't know' at each wave, in each country and for each question, see Table 3.

Cognitive response to warnings

Participants were asked 'In the last 30 days how often, if at all, did you think about what the warning labels on packs are telling you?' with response options 'Never', 'Rarely', 'Sometimes', 'Often', 'Very often' and 'Don't know'. These were coded as 'Often/Very often' vs 'Never, Rarely or Sometimes', with participants responding 'Don't know' excluded from the analysis. In terms of risk perceptions,

the wording was slightly different in Norway. In the UK participants were asked 'To what extent, if at all, have the warning labels on packs made you think about the health risks of smoking?' and in Norway this question was prefixed with 'In the last 30 days'. Participants were also asked 'To what extent, if at all, do the warning labels on packs make you more likely to quit smoking?' with response options for this and the risk perception question 'Not at all', 'A little', 'Somewhat', 'A lot' and 'Don't know'. Responses were coded as 'A lot' vs 'Not at all, A little or Somewhat', with participants responding 'Don't know' excluded from the analysis.

Behavioural reactions to warnings

To measure avoidant behaviours, participants were asked 'In the last 30 days have you done any of the following to avoid looking at the warnings on packs?... 'Avoided buying packs with particular warnings on them', 'Covered the warnings up to avoid looking at them', 'Put the pack away to avoid looking at the warning', and 'Used a cigarette case or another pack or container to avoid looking at the warnings'. Response options were 'Yes', 'No' and 'Don't know' for each, coded as 'Yes' vs 'No', with participants responding 'Don't know' excluded from the analysis. To assess forgoing cigarettes, they were asked 'In the last 30 days how many times, if any, have the warning labels on packs stopped you from having a cigarette when you were about to smoke one?' (Never, Once, A few times, Many times, Don't know). Responses were coded as 'Many times' vs 'Never, Once or A few times', with participants responding 'Don't know' excluded from the analysis.

Analysis

Data were analysed using Stata version 15. Categorical outcomes are reported as percentages.

Generalised estimating equations (GEE) were used to examine changes the proportion of smokers who reporting the warning-related outcomes across survey waves. The dependent variables for the GEE were binary so were specified as a binomial distribution, with exchangeable correlation

structure and robust standard errors. Survey wave was the independent variable and the analyses were adjusted, at each wave, for age group, gender, household income, education and cigarettes per day. The working correlation structure accounts for correlation among repeated measurements on individuals over time.

Results

W1 sample characteristics

Almost half the UK (46.4%) and Norway samples (45.0%) were male. In the UK 38.4% had at least a university degree, with 31.5% in Norway having four or more years of university or college. Most of the UK sample was in the 40-55 age group (32.9%) and most of the Norway sample in the 56 and over age group (45.8%). Further details of the sample characteristics are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

In the UK, 68.9% of the W1 sample responded at W2 and 50.9% at W3, and in Norway 63.1% of the W1 sample responded at W2. Young people were more likely to be lost to follow up, with this effect greater in the UK than in Norway. People with lower levels of education were a higher proportion of the Norway sample at baseline but had a higher probability of being retained in the UK sample.

Warning salience

How often have you noticed the warnings?

In the UK, 25.2% reported noticing the warnings often or very often at W1. This increased to 40.4% at W2 (AOR=2.13; 95% CI 1.98-2.29) and remained significantly higher at W3 (31.5%) than at W1 (AOR=1.48; 95% CI 1.36-1.62). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (OR=0.69; 95%

CI 0.63-0.76). In Norway the proportion noticing the warnings often or very often significantly decreased from W1 (34.7%) to W2 (27.4%) (AOR=0.67; 95% CI 0.56-0.80).

How often have you read or looked closely at the warnings?

In the UK, 8.6% reported reading or looking closely at warnings often or very often at W1. This increased to 16.5% at W2 (AOR=2.27; 95% CI 2.03-2.53) and remained significantly higher at W3 (12.5%) than at W1 (AOR=1.68; 95% CI 1.47-1.92). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.74; 95% CI 0.65-0.84). In Norway the proportion reading the warnings often or very often significantly decreased from W1 (12.0%) to W2 (8.0%) (AOR=0.69; 95% CI 0.52-0.93).

Warning cognitions

How often do you think about what the warnings are telling you?

In the UK, 9.0% reported thinking about warnings often or very often at W1. This increased to 14.7% at W2 (AOR=1.87; 95% CI 1.68-2.08) and remained significantly higher at W3 (12.4%) than at W1 (AOR=1.56; 95% CI 1.37-1.77). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.84; 95% CI 0.74-0.95). In Norway the proportion thinking about the warnings often or very often significantly decreased from W1 (18.7%) to W2 (13.4%) (AOR=0.69; 95% CI 0.52-0.93).

To what extent do the warnings make you think about the risks of smoking?

In the UK, 6.7% reported that the warning made them think about the risks of smoking a lot at W1. This increased to 8.9% at W2 (AOR=1.51; 95% CI 1.33-1.72) and remained significantly higher at W3 (7.4%) than at W1 (AOR=1.27; 95% CI 1.08-1.48). There was a significant decrease between W2 and

W3 (AOR=0.84; 95% CI 0.72-0.98). In Norway the extent to which warnings make participants more likely to think about the risks a lot decreased from W1 (12.0%) to W2 (7.6%) (AOR=0.56; 95% CI 0.42-0.75).

To what extent do warnings make you more likely to quit?

In the UK, 2.3% of smokers said that warnings made them a lot more likely to quit at W1. This significantly increased to 3.5% at W2 (AOR=1.59; 95% CI 1.27-1.99) but there was no difference at W3 (2.6 %) than at W1 (AOR=1.25; 95% CI 0.95-1.65). There was also no difference between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.79; 95% CI 0.60-1.04). In Norway the extent to which warnings made participants more likely to quit a lot significantly decreased from W1 (8.1%) to W2 (5.1%) (OR=0.64; 95% CI 0.44-0.92).

Behavioural reactions to warnings

Avoided warnings

In the UK, 2.3% reported avoiding warnings at W1. This increased to 3.4% at W2 (AOR=1.72; 95% CI 1.38-2.15) and remained significantly higher at W3 (2.7%) than at W1 (AOR=1.34; 95% CI 1.02-1.77). There was no difference between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.78; 0.59-1.03). In Norway there was no difference from W1 (2.6%) to W2 (2.5%) (AOR=0.84; 95% CI 0.48-1.44).

Covered warnings

In the UK, 8.8% reported covering warnings at W1. This increased to 16.4% at W2 (AOR=2.19; 95% CI 1.96-2.44) and remained significantly higher at W3 (12.0%) than at W1 (AOR=1.56; 95% CI 1.36-1.78). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.71; 95% CI 0.62-0.81). In Norway there was no difference from W1 (5.2%) to W2 (4.6%) (AOR=0.88; 95% CI 0.60-1.31).

Put pack away

In the UK, 10.2% reported putting the pack away to avoid the warnings at W1. This increased to 19.3% at W2 (AOR=2.32; 95% CI 2.10-2.56) and remained significantly higher at W3 (14.6%) than at W1 (AOR=1.71; 95% CI 1.52-1.94). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.74; 95% CI 0.66-0.83). In Norway there was no difference from W1 (7.8%) to W2 (5.6%) (AOR=0.77; 95% CI 0.55-1.09).

Used a case

In the UK, 4.3% reported using a case at W1. This increased to 12.1% at W2 (AOR=2.95; 95% CI 2.59-3.36) and remained significantly higher at W3 (9.5%) than at W1 (AOR=2.24; 95% CI 1.92-2.62). There was a significant decrease between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.76, 95% CI 0.66-0.87). In Norway there was no difference from W1 (4.6%) to W2 (4.4%) (AOR=0.87; 95% CI 0.59-1.30).

Forgoing a cigarette

In the UK, 9.4% reported forgoing a cigarette at W1. This increased to 11.7% at W2 (AOR=1.37; 95% CI 1.23-1.53) and remained significantly higher at W3 (10.9%) than at W1 (AOR=1.32; 95% CI 1.16-1.50). There was no difference between W2 and W3 (AOR=0.98; 95% CI 0.85-1.10). In Norway there was no difference from W1 (17.7%) to W2 (13.8%) (AOR=0.85; 95% CI 0.68-1.05).

Discussion

In the UK there was an increase in warning salience, cognition and behavioural reactions from W1 (pre-standardised packaging) to W2 (shortly after standardised packaging and the new health warnings were fully implemented), and a decrease from W2 to W3 (approximately two years post-standardised packaging) but with responses remaining higher than at W1. In Norway there was a decrease in warning salience and cognition from W1 (pre-standardised packaging) to W2 (shortly after standardised packaging was fully implemented).

In markets with standardised packaging it has not been possible to know whether increased warning salience and effectiveness is a result of the large novel warnings, the removal of full branding, or both.^{9,17} However, recent longitudinal research in multiple European countries has offered valuable insight into how removing full branding alongside the introduction of stronger (larger novel pictorial) warnings, rather than just introducing stronger warnings, helps increase warning salience.¹⁵ Our findings complement this study by demonstrating the benefits, in terms of improving warning salience and effectiveness, of introducing standardised packaging and stronger warnings simultaneously rather than introducing standardised packaging while retaining weaker (smaller old text/pictorial) warnings.

That the warnings on standardised packs in the UK were new, displayed coloured pictorial images on the main display areas (rather than just the pack reverse), had images that were rotated annually, started from the top of the pack (rather than the bottom), and covered a greater proportion of the main display areas (65% front and reverse compared with 43% front and 53% pack reverse), helps explain the findings.^{1,18-26} In Norway, in contrast, the warnings were unchanged, with the two small text warnings on the pack front, the most visible surface, having been on packs for approximately seven years by W2. That smokers in Norway would be even more desensitised to the warnings at W2 than at W1 may help to explain why salience and cognitive response to the warnings significantly decreased. It may also explain why behavioural reactions (avoidant behaviour and forgoing cigarettes) remained unchanged between waves - smokers were engaging less with the warnings and so had less reason to conceal them or smoke less as a result of them.

The findings from the third wave in the UK, conducted approximately two years post-standardised packaging, show that warning salience and effectiveness remained significantly higher than at the first wave (with the exception of warnings making them want to quit a lot, which remained higher but not significantly so), suggesting this response is sustained over time. However, a decline in warning salience and effectiveness was observed during the post-standardised

packaging waves, which is consistent with research showing that people get used to the presence or content of warnings.²⁷⁻⁹ While with adolescent smokers and non-smokers rather than adult smokers, cross-sectional school surveys in Australia found that compared to baseline (pre-standardised), approximately five years post-standardised packaging there were no significant differences in attending to, reading, or talking about, warnings, and a decline in thinking about warnings.³⁰ Whether there will be a similar trend in Britain (Scotland, Wales and England) is not clear given that a new set of 13 warnings, taken from warnings used in Australia since 2002, will be required for packs placed on the market after January 2021, as part of the *Tobacco Products and Nicotine Inhaling Products (Amendment etc.) (EU Exit) Regulations*;³¹ the current warnings will remain on packs in Northern Ireland as part of the Northern Ireland Protocol.

The findings should be considered in light of a number of limitations. Limitations associated with the sampling design mean that the findings cannot necessarily be generalised to the wider population of smokers. The samples were drawn from online panels. As participants are not necessarily selected onto these panels using probabilistic sampling we cannot be certain that these panels are representative of smokers in each country.^{32,33} Furthermore, online administration means that populations that are more likely to lack internet access (e.g. the elderly, those on the lowest incomes) may be under-represented. The surveys also under-represent younger smokers. In addition, our findings are reliant on self-report. Attrition is also a problem with longitudinal research,³⁴ with approximately half (49%) the UK sample lost by W3 and 37% of the Norway sample by W2. In our samples, young people (under 24 years) were more likely to be lost to follow up, particularly in the UK. This differential attrition is likely to bias the effect in the direction of underestimating the impact of the warnings as younger adults are more likely to have greater warning salience, and/or cognitive and behavioural response to warnings.³⁵⁻³⁷

For countries moving towards standardised packaging our findings suggest that combining this with large novel pictorial warnings is the optimal approach.

Funding

The first two waves in the UK were funded by Cancer Research UK and the British Heart Foundation (Grant No: A18507), with the third wave funded by the Department of Health and Social Care through the Public Health Research Consortium (PHRC). The study in Norway was funded by the Norwegian Institute of Public Health.

Declaration of Interests

None declared.

Accepted Manuscript

References

1. World Health Organisation. Guidelines for implementation of Article 11 of the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control; 2008. www.who.int/fctc/guidelines/article_11.pdf Accessed 8 September 2020
2. Munafò M, Roberts N, Bauld L, Ute L. Plain packaging increases visual attention to health warnings on cigarette packs in non-smokers and weekly smokers but not daily smokers. *Addiction* 2022;106:1505-10. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03430.x
3. Maynard OM, Leonards U, Attwood AS, Bauld L, Hogarth L, Munafò M. Effects of first exposure to plain cigarette packaging on smoking behaviour and attitudes: a randomised controlled study. *BMC Pub Health* 2015;15:240. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1586-8
4. Moodie C, Hastings GB, Mackintosh AM, Ford A. Young adult smokers' perceptions of plain packaging: A pilot naturalistic study. *Tob Control* 2011;20:367-73. doi: 10.1136/tc.2011.042911
5. Moodie C, Mackintosh AM. Young adult women smokers' perceptions of using plain cigarette packaging: A naturalistic approach. *Br Med J Open* 2013;3:e002402. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002402
6. Moodie C, Hoek J, Scheffels J, Gallopel-Morvan K, Lindorff K. Plain packaging: Legislative differences in Australia, France, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Norway, and options for strengthening regulations. *Tob Control* 2019;28:485-92. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054483
7. Retzler C, Shiraj N, Retzler J. Eye movement data reveal increased attention to combined health warnings on cigarette packs. *Drug Alc Dep* 2019;194:336-40. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.11.004
8. Poundall T, Bogdanovica I, Langley T. A cross-sectional study of the impact of standardised tobacco packaging legislation on university students. *J Child Adol Subst Abuse* 2018;27:165- 73. doi: 10.1080/1067828X.2018.1431992

9. Moodie C, Brose LS, Lee HS, Power E, Bauld L. How did smokers respond to standardised cigarette packaging with new, larger health warnings in the United Kingdom during the transition period? A cross-sectional online survey. *Addict Res Theory* 2020;28:53-61. doi: 10.1080/16066359.2019.1579803
10. Hoek J, Wong C, Gendall P, Louviere J, Cong K. Effects of dissuasive packaging on young adult smokers. *Tob Control* 2011;20:183–8. doi: 10.1136/tc.2010.037861
11. Dunlop SM, Dobbins T, Young JM, Perez C, Currow DC. Impact of Australia's introduction of tobacco plain packs on adult smokers' pack-related perceptions and responses: results from a continuous tracking survey. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e005836. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005836
12. Yong HH, Borland R, Hammond D, Thrasher JF, Cummings KM, Fong GT. Smokers' reactions to the new larger health warning labels on plain cigarette packs in Australia: findings from the ITC Australia project. *Tob Control* 2016;25:181-7. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051979
13. Wakefield M, Coomber K, Zacher M, Durkin S, Brennan E, Scollo M. Australian adult smokers' responses to plain packaging with larger graphic health warnings 1 year after implementation: results from a national cross-sectional tracking survey. *Tob Control* 2015;24:ii17-25. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-052050
14. European Commission. Directive 2014/40/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States concerning the manufacture, presentation and sale of tobacco and related products and repealing Directive 2001/37/EC. *Off J Eur Union* 2014;L127:1-38.
15. Aleyan S, Driezen P, McNeill A, et al. Evaluating the impact of introducing standardized packaging with larger health-warning labels in England: findings from adult smokers within the EUREST-PLUS ITC Europe Surveys. *Eur J Pub Health* 2020;30(Suppl3):iii91–7. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckaa053

16. European Commission. EU Directive 2001/37/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5th June 2001. *Off J Eur Communities* 2001;L194/26:1-10.
17. White V, Bariola E, Faulkner A, Coomber K, Wakefield M. Graphic health warnings on cigarette packs: how long before the effects on adolescents wear out? *Nicot Tob Res* 2015;17:776-83. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntu184
18. Young SL. Increasing the noticeability of warnings, effects of pictorial color, signal, icon and border. In: *Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 36th Annual Meeting*. Human Factors Society, Santa Monica, CA, pp. 580–584; 1991.
19. Parsons SO, Seminara JL, Wogalter MS. "A summary of warnings research." *Ergon Design* 1999;7:21-31. doi: 10.1177/106480469900700105
20. Wogalter MS, Conzola VC, Smith-Jackson TL. Research-based guidelines for warning design and evaluation. *Appl Ergon* 2002;33:219–30. doi: 10.1016/S0003-6870(02)00009-1
21. Graham DJ, Jeffery RW. Location, location, location: eye-tracking evidence that consumers preferentially view prominently positioned nutrition information. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2011;111:1704–11. doi: 10.1016/j.jada.2011.08.005
22. Orquin JL, Mueller Loose S. Attention and choice: a review on eye movements in decision making. *Acta Psychol* 2013;144:190–206. doi: 10.1016/j.actpsy.2013.06.003
23. Noar SM, Hall MG, Francis DB, Ribisl KM, Pepper JK, Brewer NT. Pictorial cigarette pack warnings: a meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Tob Control* 2016;25:341–54. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2014-051978
24. Hwang JE, Yang YS, Oh YM, Lee SY, Lee JE, Cho SI. Differences in visual fixation duration according to the position of graphic health warning labels: An eye-tracking approach. *Tob Induced Dis* 2018;16. doi: 10.18332/tid/94327

25. Ratih SP, Susanna D. Perceived effectiveness of pictorial health warnings on changes in smoking behaviour in Asia: a literature review. *BMC Pub Health* 2018;18:1165. doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-60720-7
26. Sillero-Rejon C, Leonards U, Munafò MR, et al. Avoidance of tobacco health warnings? An eye-tracking approach. *Addiction*, in press. doi: 10.1111/add.15148
27. Woelbert E, d'Hombres B. Pictorial health warnings and wear-out effects: evidence from a web experiment in 10 European countries. *Tob Control* 2019;28:e71-6. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054402
28. Argo JJ, Main KJ. Meta-analyses of the effectiveness of warning labels. *J Pub Policy Market* 2004;23:193-208. doi: 10.1509/jppm.23.2.193.51400
29. Li L, Borland R, Yong H, et al. Longer term impact of cigarette package warnings in Australia compared with the United Kingdom and Canada. *Health Educ Res* 2015 1;30:67-80. doi: 10.1093/her/cyu074
30. White VM, Guerin N, Williams T, Wakefield M. Long-term impact of plain packaging of cigarettes with larger graphic health warnings: findings from cross-sectional surveys of Australian adolescents between 2011 and 2017. *Tob Control* 2019;28:e77-e84. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2019-054988
31. UK Government. The Tobacco Products and Nicotine Inhaling Products (Amendment etc.) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2019/41/made Accessed 15 September 2020.
32. Walter SL, Seibert SE, Goering D, O'Boyle EH. A tale of two sample sources: Do results from online panel data and conventional data converge? *J Bus Psychol* 2019;(34):425-52. doi: 10.1007/s10869-018-9552-y
33. Porter COLH, Outlaw R, Gale JP, Cho TS. The use of online panel data in management research: A review and recommendations. *J Management* 2019;45(1):319-44. doi: 10.1177/0149206318811569

34. Watson N, Wooden M. Identifying factors affecting longitudinal survey response. In: Lynn P, editor. Methodology of longitudinal surveys. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2009:157-181.
35. Borland R. Tobacco health warnings and smoking-related cognitions and behaviours. *Addiction* 1997;92(11):1427-35. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.1997.tb02864.x
36. Hammond D, Reid JL, Driezen P, Boudreau C. Pictorial health warnings on cigarette packs in the United States: an experimental evaluation of the proposed FDA warnings. *Nic Tob Res* 2012;13;15(1):93-102. doi: 10.1093/ntr/nts094
37. Swayampakala K, Thrasher JF, Yong HH, et al. Over-time impacts of pictorial health warning labels and their differences across smoker subgroups: Results from adult smokers in Canada and Australia. *Nic Tob Res* 2018;20(7):888-96. doi: 10.1093/ntr/ntx134

Accepted Manuscript

Table 1: Characteristics of the full sample by survey wave and country

	UK			Norway	
	Wave			Wave	
Education	1	2	3	1	2
Low	2032	1465	1096	720	521
%	32.6	34.1	34.5	43.24	49.6
Medium	1610	991	720	421	142
%	25.8	23.1	22.7	25.3	13.5
High	2396	1693	1270	524	388
%	38.4	39.4	40	31.5	36.9
Don't know or prefer not to say	195	144	89	0	0
%	3.1	3.4	2.8	0	0
Gender					
Male	2889	2006	1519	749	479
%	46.4	46.7	47.8	45.0	45.6
Female	3344	2287	1656	916	572
%	53.7	53.3	52.2	55.0	54.4
Gross household income					
Low	2840	1909	1359	627	172
%	45.6	44.5	42.8	37.7	16.4
Medium	1294	894	664	571	299
%	20.8	20.8	20.9	34.3	28.5
High	969	665	563	243	173
%	15.6	15.5	17.7	14.6	16.5
Don't know or prefer not to answer	1130	825	589	224	407

%	18.1	19.2	18.6	13.5	38.7
Age group					
16 to 24	650	181	82	51	15
%	10.4	4.2	2.58	3.1	1.4
25 to 39	1795	1089	682	299	155
%	28.8	25.4	21.5	18.0	14.8
40 to 55	2053	1497	1140	553	320
%	32.9	34.9	35.9	33.2	30.5
56 and over	1735	1497	1271	762	561
%	27.8	34.9	40.0	45.8	53.4
Cigarettes per day					
10 or fewer	3391	1850	1217	1008	487
%	54.4	43.1	38.3	60.5	46.3
11-20	2293	1441	947	555	288
%	36.8	33.6	29.8	33.3	27.4
21-30	435	268	208	49	24
%	7.0	6.2	6.6	2.9	2.3
31 or more	114	69	42	12	7
%	1.8	1.6	1.3	0.7	0.7
Missing	0	665	761	41	245
%	0	15.5	24.0	2.5	23.3
Total	6233	4293	3175	1665	1051
%	100	68.9	50.9	100	63.1

Table 2: Characteristics of cigarette smokers by survey wave and country

	UK			Norway	
	Wave			Wave	
Education	1	2	3	1	2
Low	2032	1271	859	720 ^a	414 ^b
%	32.6	35.0	35.6	43.24	50.9
Medium	1610	837	535	421 ^a	104 ^b
%	25.8	23.2	22.2	25.3	12.8
High	2396	1407	948	524 ^a	295 ^b
%	38.4	38.8	39.3	31.5	36.3
Don't know or prefer not to say	195	114	70	0 ^a	0 ^b
%	3.1	3.1	2.9	0	0
Gender					
Male	2889	1687	1153	749	356
%	46.4	46.5	47.8	45.0	43.8
Female	3344	1942	1259	916	457
%	53.7	53.5	52.2	55.0	56.2
Gross household income					
Low	2840	1657	1058	627 ^c	131 ^d
%	45.6	45.7	43.9	37.7	16.1
Medium	1294	743	506	571 ^c	224 ^d

%	20.8	20.5	21.0	34.3	27.6
High	969	549	407	243 ^c	126 ^d
%	15.6	15.1	16.9	14.6	15.5
Don't know or prefer not to answer	1130	680	441	224 ^c	332 ^d
%	18.1	18.7	18.3	13.5	40.8
Age group					
16 to 24	650	132	57	51 ^e	4 ^f
%	10.4	3.6	2.4	3.1	0.5
25 to 39	1795	867	486	299 ^e	114 ^f
%	28.8	23.9	20.2	18.0	14.0
40 to 55	2053	1287	876	553 ^e	257 ^f
%	32.9	35.5	36.3	33.2	31.6
56 and over	1735	1343	992	762 ^e	438 ^f
%	27.8	37.0	41.1	45.8	53.9
Cigarettes per day					
10 or fewer	3391	1850	1215	1008 ^g	487 ^h
%	54.4	51.0	50.4	60.5	59.9
11-20	2293	1441	947	555 ^g	288 ^h
%	36.8	39.7	39.3	33.3	35.4
21-30	435	268	208	49 ^g	24 ^h
%	7.0	7.4	8.6	2.9	3.0
31 or more	114	69	42	12 ^g	7 ^h
%	1.8	1.9	1.7	0.7	0.9
Missing	0	1	0	41 ^g	7 ^h

%	0	0.03	0	2.5	0.9
Total	6233	3629	2412	1665	813
%	100	58.2	38.7	100	48.8

^a W1 Norway vs W1 UK sig different chi square= 577.8921 p<0.001

^b W2 Norway vs W2 UK sig different chi square= 103.9543 p<0.001

^c W1 Norway vs W1 UK sig different chi square= 138.1678 p<0.001

^d W2 Norway vs W2 UK sig different chi square= 301.7732 p<0.001

^e W1 Norway vs W1 UK sig different chi square= 272.1966 p<0.001

^f W2 Norway vs W2 UK sig different chi square= 100.7198 p<0.001

^h W1 Norway vs W1 UK sig different chi square= 211.7629 p<0.001

^h W2 Norway vs W2 UK sig different chi square= 62.8587 p<0.001

Accepted Manuscript

Table 3: Numbers and percentages of responding 'Don't know' to each measure

		UK				Norway				
		W2		W3		W1		W2		
W1 n		n		n		n		n		
%		%		%		%		%		
Noticed warnings										
	74	1.19	52	0.83	72	1.16	32	1.93	45	4.45
Read warnings										
	62	0.99	37	0.59	46	0.74	29	1.75	27	2.67
Thought about warnings										
	63	1.01	56	0.90	50	0.80	33	1.99	24	2.37
Warnings risk										
	65	1.04	77	1.24	64	1.03	44	2.66	35	3.46
Avoided warnings										
	87	1.40	49	1.14	37	1.53	41	2.48	15	1.92

Covered warnings

83	1.33	47	1.09	31	1.28	23	1.39	6	0.77
----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	---	------

Put pack away

86	1.38	50	1.16	44	1.82	28	1.69	7	0.90
----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	---	------

Used a case

81	1.30	43	1.00	36	1.49	21	1.27	2	0.26
----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	---	------

Forgone cigarettes

124	1.99	134	3.12	122	3.84	79	4.78	64	6.33
-----	------	-----	------	-----	------	----	------	----	------

Thought about quitting

146	2.34	95	2.21	74	3.07	78	4.72	44	5.63
-----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------

Figure 1

